

#### CONSULTANT SELECTION COMBINED CONSENSUS SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description

Wenatchee Valley College - Omak Health Science Center

Project Number

2021-208

Name of Selection Panel Chair

**Eric Lester** 

Phase 1 - SOQ	Date:	8/31/2021		Number of Subn	mber of Submitting Firms:		
			Panelist Names			TOTAL	
Firms	Eric Lester	Barbie Downing	Brett Riley	Rich Peters	Larry Gangle	PANEL RANKED	PHASE 1 RANK ORDER
	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	SCORE	
1 MMEC Architecture	2	4	1	2	3	12	2
2 Design West Architects	3	2	5	4	2	16	3
3 ALSC Architecture	1	1	2	1	1	6	1
4 Cortner Architectural	5	5	4	5	5	24	5
5 RGU Architecture	4	3	3	3	4	17	4
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
Phase 2 Interview	Date:	9/14-15/2021		N	Number of Firms	Interviewed:	3
			R OF COMMITTE	E MEMBERS			
Firms	Eric Lester	Barbie Downing	Brett Riley	Rich Peters	Larry Gangle	TOTAL ASSIGNED RANKS	FINAL RANK ORDER
	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order		
1 ALSC Architecture	1	1	1	1	1	5	1
2 MMEC Architecture	3	3	3	3	3	15	3
3 Design West Architects	2	2	2	2	2	10	2
4	_	_	_	_			
5							
<b>□</b>	6.1	l .					



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

# Project description Wenatchee Valley College - Omak Health Science Center

Consensus Date

Project Number

8/31/2021

2021-208

Name of Selection Panel Member

**Eric Lester** 

CRITERIA		Qualification of Key Personnel		Relevent Experience		Past Performance		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		le Design ience	TOTAL RAW	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
Scores	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	5%	Raw Score	5%	SCORE	SCORE	ONDER
1 MMEC Architecture	93.0	27.9	90.0	27.0	95.0	28.5	95.0	4.8	95.0	4.8	468.0	92.9	2
2 Design West Architects	90.0	27.0	85.0	25.5	93.0	27.9	80.0	4.0	80.0	4.0	428.0	88.4	3
3 ALSC Architecture	95.0	28.5	90.0	27.0	95.0	28.5	95.0	4.8	95.0	4.8	470.0	93.5	1
4 Cortner Architectural	87.0	26.1	75.0	22.5	80.0	24.0	70.0	3.5	75.0	3.8	387.0	79.9	5
5 RGU Architecture	89.0	26.7	85.0	25.5	85.0	25.5	80.0	4.0	80.0	4.0	419.0	85.7	4
6													
7													
8													
9													
10													
11													
12													
13													
14													
15													
16													
17													
18													
19													
20													
COMMENTS:	·		·		·		·					·	

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Both MMEC and	AT SC SOO	showed aroutest	strongth in all	antagorias

Design West was strong overall, but relative to MMEC and ALSC in Personnel and Experince

RGU also lacked in Experience as compared to top scorers, Past Performance not as strong Cortner SOQ not as polished, not as strong as other contenders in Personnel, Experince

ric Lester	8/31/2021
ric Lester	Date



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description
Wenatchee Valley College - Omak Health

Science Center
Consensus Date Project Number

8/31/2021 2021-208

Name of Selection Panel Member

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record Barbie Downing

CRITERIA	Qualification of Key Personnel		Relevent Experience		Past Performance		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		Sustainable Design Experience			TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
Scores	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	5%	Raw Score	5%	SCORE	SCORE	
1 MMEC Architecture	100.0	30.0	99.0	29.7	94.0	28.2	94.0	4.7	94.0	4.7	481.0	97.3	4
2 Design West Architects	100.0	30.0	99.0	29.7	95.0	28.5	95.0	4.8	94.0	4.7	483.0	97.7	2
3 ALSC Architecture	100.0	30.0	99.0	29.7	95.0	28.5	95.0	4.8	95.0	4.8	484.0	97.7	1
4 Cortner Architectural	100.0	30.0	99.0	29.7	94.0	28.2	93.0	4.7	93.0	4.7	479.0	97.2	5
5 RGU Architecture	100.0	30.0	99.0	29.7	94.0	28.2	95.0	4.8	95.0	4.8	483.0	97.4	3
6													
7													
8													
9													
10													
11													
12													
13													
14													
15													
16													
17													
18													
19													
20													

COMMENTS:

sarbie Downing

8/31/2021

Date



**CONSULTANT SELECTION** PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description  Wenatchee Valley Co	llege - Omak Health									
Science Center										
Consensus Date	Project Number									
8/31/2021	2021-208									
Name of Selection Panel Member										

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

**Brett Riley** 

CRITERIA		lification of Personnel			Past Perf	Past Performance		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		Sustainable Design Experience		TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
\$	Scores Raw So	core 30%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	5%	Raw Score	5%	SCORE	SCORE	
1 MMEC Architecture	90.	27.0	100.0	30.0	95.0	28.5	90.0	4.5	90.0	4.5	465.0	94.5	1
2 Design West Architects	90.	27.0	90.0	27.0	88.0	26.4	95.0	4.8	95.0	4.8	458.0	89.9	5
3 ALSC Architecture	90.	27.0	100.0	30.0	88.0	26.4	95.0	4.8	95.0	4.8	468.0	92.9	2
4 Cortner Architectural	90.	27.0	85.0	25.5	95.0	28.5	90.0	4.5	90.0	4.5	450.0	90.0	4
5 RGU Architecture	90.	27.0	100.0	30.0	85.0	25.5	90.0	4.5	90.0	4.5	455.0	91.5	3
6													
7													
8													
9													
10													
11													
12													
13													
14													
15													
16													
17													
18													
19													
20													
COMMENTS:		Į.					<u> </u>		<u>.</u>				Į

Brett Riley
Brett Riley (Sep 16, 2021 16:01 PDT)

**Brett Riley** 

Date



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET Project description

Wenatchee Valley College - Omak Health **Science Center** 

**Rich Peters** 

Consensus Date

Project Number

8/31/2021

2021-208

Name of Selection Panel Member

#### This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

CRITERIA	Qualification of Key Personnel			Relevent Experience		Past Performance		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		le Design ience	RAW	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
Scores	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	5%	Raw Score	5%	SCORE	SCORE	
1 MMEC Architecture	95.0	28.5	90.0	27.0	90.0	27.0	95.0	4.8	90.0	4.5	460.0	91.8	2
2 Design West Architects	80.0	24.0	85.0	25.5	85.0	25.5	85.0	4.3	85.0	4.3	420.0	83.5	4
3 ALSC Architecture	90.0	27.0	95.0	28.5	95.0	28.5	90.0	4.5	95.0	4.8	465.0	93.3	1
4 Cortner Architectural	80.0	24.0	80.0	24.0	85.0	25.5	85.0	4.3	85.0	4.3	415.0	82.0	5
5 RGU Architecture	95.0	28.5	90.0	27.0	90.0	27.0	85.0	4.3	85.0	4.3	445.0	91.0	3
6													
7													
8													
9													
10													
11													
12													
13													
14													
15													
16													
17													
18													
19													
20													

COMMENTS:

Rich Peters
Rich Peters (Sep 16, 2021 16:19 PDT

Rich Peters



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Wenatchee Valley College - Omak Health										
	e Center									
Consensus Date	Project Number									
8/31/2021	2021-208									

Name of Selection Panel Member

### **Larry Gangle**

	Qualification of Key Personnel			Relevent Experience		Past Performance		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		_	RAW		RANK		
Scores Rav	w Score	30%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	5%	Raw Score	5%	SCORE	SCORE			
	90.0	27.0	85.0	25.5	90.0	27.0	100.0	5.0	100.0	5.0	465.0	89.5	3		
	90.0	27.0	92.0	27.6	95.0	28.5	90.0	4.5	100.0	5.0	467.0	92.6	2		
	95.0	28.5	95.0	28.5	95.0	28.5	100.0	5.0	100.0	5.0	485.0	95.5	1		
	75.0	22.5	60.0	18.0	80.0	24.0	100.0	5.0	90.0	4.5	405.0	74.0	5		
	90.0	27.0	90.0	27.0	85.0	25.5	90.0	4.5	100.0	5.0	455.0	89.0	4		
	Scores Ra		Key Personnel           Scores         Raw Score         30%           90.0         27.0           90.0         27.0           95.0         28.5           75.0         22.5	Key Personnel         Exper           Scores         Raw Score         30%         Raw Score           90.0         27.0         85.0           90.0         27.0         92.0           95.0         28.5         95.0           75.0         22.5         60.0	Key Personnel         Experience           Scores         Raw Score         30%         Raw Score         30%           90.0         27.0         85.0         25.5           90.0         27.0         92.0         27.6           95.0         28.5         95.0         28.5           75.0         22.5         60.0         18.0	Key Personnel         Experience         Past Performance           Scores         Raw Score         30%         Raw Score         30%         Raw Score           90.0         27.0         85.0         25.5         90.0           90.0         27.0         92.0         27.6         95.0           95.0         28.5         95.0         28.5         95.0           75.0         22.5         60.0         18.0         80.0	Key Personnel         Experience         Past Performance           Scores         Raw Score         30%         Raw Score         30%           90.0         27.0         85.0         25.5         90.0         27.0           90.0         27.0         92.0         27.6         95.0         28.5           95.0         28.5         95.0         28.5         95.0         28.5           75.0         22.5         60.0         18.0         80.0         24.0	Scores   Raw Score   30%   R	Key Personnel         Experience         Past Performance Experience         Analysis Experience           Scores         Raw Score         30%         Raw Score         30%         Raw Score         5%           90.0         27.0         85.0         25.5         90.0         27.0         100.0         5.0           90.0         27.0         92.0         27.6         95.0         28.5         90.0         4.5           95.0         28.5         95.0         28.5         100.0         5.0           75.0         22.5         60.0         18.0         80.0         24.0         100.0         5.0	Name	No.   Past Performance   Past	Note	Note		

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

COMMENTS:

Molefile	
	8/31/2021
Larry Gangle	Date

#### CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description Wenatchee Valley College - Omak Health Science Center Project Number Date of Evaluation 2021-208 9/14-15/2021 Name of Selection Panel Member Eric Lester

This Scoresheet Bed	This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record					Eric Lester							
CRITERIA	Mainhtin n		chitecture	MMEC Ar	chitecture	Desigr Archi	n West itects						
ONTENA	Weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score		
ORGANIZATION	15%	97.0	14.6	97.0	14.6	94.0	14.1						
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project	t for the Clier	nt. What is t	heir philosop	ohy towords	working coll	aboratively v	with clients a	and other ou	tward looking	g issues.			
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members pre	sent and wh	at role are th	ney assumin	g in the disc	ussion								
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their worklo	ad for the du	uration of the	e project and	how this p	roject fits into	the firm's o	verall plann	ing					
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	25%	97.0	24.3	95.0	23.8	96.0	24.0						
<u>Scope Management</u> : Based on the information provided and the of project scope in the past.	Finalist's exp	erience, hov	w well has th	e team ace	rtained basic	project requ	uirements a	nd how well	have they m	anaged dev	elopment		
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to ex	stablish and	manage pro	ject budgets	. How succ	essful have	they been w	ith past pro	jects					
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedule	s. How well	do they liste	n to client so	chedule nee	ds and then	meet client	schedule ne	eds.					
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	98.0	24.5	94.0	23.5	95.0	23.8						
<u>Understanding of this project</u> : Has the Finalist demonstrated that the project and the project requirements	they have re	viewed avai	lable project	information	, attended in	formational	mtg, or don	e independe	nt research	to better und	derstand		
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define of	hallenges ar	nd/or opport	unities they s	see for the p	roject?								
EXPERIENCE	25%	98.0	24.5	93.0	23.3	95.0	23.8						
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss pas	t work the fire	m has done	and how tha	at relates or	provides gu	idance for th	is project?						
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual team			000100001000010001000100		project type					1			
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	5%	97.0	4.9	97.0	4.9	97.0	4.9						
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive I and ELCCA?	ife Cycle Co	st exercise	in decision n	naking? Are	e they familia	r with the O	FM requiren	nents? Are t	hey differen	tiating betwe	en LCCA		
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	5%	97.0	4.9	97.0	4.9	97.0	4.9						
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate	for this proje	ct. How can	the sustain	ability strate	gys mesh wi	th the projec	ct budget.	•					
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored	Subr	mitted										
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	584.0		573.0		574.0							
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			97.5		94.8		95.3						
FINAL RANK ORDER			1		3		2						
COMMENTS:													

ALSC: Very good presentation, excellent approach; strong team

MMEC: Good presentation, little tribe / fed exp

Design W: Good pres Amy strong/nurse; culture; LCC & sust

## CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Wenatchee Valley Colleg	je - Omak Health Scienc
Cei	nter
Date of Evaluation	Project Number
9/14-15/2021	2021-208
Name of Selection Panel Member	

#### This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

inis Scoresneet Be	Comes	Fublic	Record				Daik	ne Dow	illig		
CRITERIA	Weighting	ALSC Arc	chitecture	MMEC Ar	chitecture	Desigr Archi					
ONTENA	vveignting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	15%	99.0	14.9	95.0	14.3	96.0	14.4				
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project	for the Clie	nt. What is	their philoso	phy towords	s working co	llaboratively	with clients	and other o	utward look	ing issues.	
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members pre	sent and wh	at role are tl	hey assumir	g in the disc	cussion						
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their workle	oad for the d	uration of th	ne project an	d how this p	oroject fits in	to the firm's	overall plan	ning			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	25%	99.0	24.8	95.0	23.8	96.0	24.0				
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the of project scope in the past.	Finalist's exp	erience, ho	w well has th	ne team ace	rtained basi	c project req	uirements a	and how well	have they	managed de	velopment
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to e	stablish and	manage pro	oject budget	s. How succ	cessful have	they been v	vith past pro	jects			
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedule	s. How well	do they liste	en to client s	chedule nee	ds and then	meet client	schedule ne	eeds.			
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	99.0	24.8	97.0	24.3	98.0	24.5				
<u>Understanding of this project</u> : Has the Finalist demonstrated that the project and the project requirements						nformational	l mtg, or dor	ne independ	ent researcl	h to better ur	nderstand
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define of								1	T		F
EXPERIENCE	25%	97.0	24.3	90.0	22.5	95.0	23.8				
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss pas											
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual tea		99.0	5.0	99.0	project type	e or complex	4.9				
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	5%										
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive L and ELCCA?	ife Cycle Co	st exercise	in decision i	making? Ar	e they famili	ar with the C	)FM require	ments? Are	they differe	entiating betv	veen LCC
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	5%	98.0	4.9	98.0	4.9	97.0	4.9				l
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate	for this proje	ect. How ca	n the sustair	nability strate	egys mesh v	vith the proje	ect budget.				
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored										
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	591.0		574.0		580.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			98.5		94.6		96.4				
FINAL RANK ORDER			1		3		2				
COMMENTS:											

Barbie Downing

15Sept21

## CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

	Cente	)T			
Date of Evaluation		Project	Number	2010	343
			202	1-208	3

### This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

CRITERIA	Weighting		chitecture	MMEC Ar	chitecture	Design West Architects		Enter Firm Name Here			213
UNITERIA	Yeigitalig	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	15%	90.0	13.5	90.0	13.5	90.0	13.5				
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this pr	oject for the Clie	nt. What is	their philoso	phy toword	s working co	llaboratively	with clients	and other o	utward looki	ng issues.	
Feam Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members	present and wh	at role are t	they assumi	ng in the dis	cussion						
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their w	orkload for the	Juration of the	he project ar	d how this	project fits in	to the firm's	overall plan	ning			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	25%	90.0	22.5	90.0	22.5	95.0	23.6			ATTA - 25 - 21	
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and of project scope in the past.  Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use									have they r	nanaged de	velopmer
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop sche	dules. How well	do they list	en to client s	chedule nec	ds and then	meet client	schedule ne	eds.			
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	95.0	23.8	90.0	22.5	90.0	22.8				
the project and the project requirements  Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to def	ine challenges a	nd/or oppor	tunities they	see for the	project?						
	25%	95.0	23.6	85.0	21.8	85.0	21.2			5 2 4 1000	
1 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 -	past work the fi	m has done		at relates o	0.000,000,000,000	uidance for	2,0739,00				
EXPERIENCE  Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss  Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individu  LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	past work the fi	m has done		at relates o	0.000,000,000,000	uidance for	2,0739,00				
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individu	past work the fi al team member 5%	m has done s have expe 90.0	erience that	elates to the	project type	uidance for or comple 85.0	xity?		e they differe	ntiating betw	ween LCC
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individu LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehens	past work the fi al team member 5%	m has done s have expe 90.0	erience that	elates to the	project type	uidance for or comple 85.0	xity?		e they differe	ntiating bety	ween LCC
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individu LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehens and ELCCA?	past work the fi al team member 5% ive Life Cycle Co	m has done s have expe 90.0 ost exercise	in decision	elates to the 90.0 making? Ar	e project type	e or comple 85.0 ar with the 6	xity?  DFM require		e they differe	ntiating betw	ween LCC
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individu LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehens and ELCCA?  SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE  What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be approprionities.	past work the fi al team member 5% ive Life Cycle Co	m has done s have expe 90.0 ost exercise	in decision	elates to the 90.0 making? Ar	e project type	e or comple 85.0 ar with the 6	xity?  DFM require		a they differe	ntiating bety	ween LCC
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individu LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehens and ELCCA?  SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriately by	past work the fi al team member 5% ive Life Cycle Co	m has done s have expe 90.0 ost exercise	in decision	elates to the 90.0 making? Ar	e project type	e or comple 85.0 ar with the 6	xity?  DFM require		a they differe	ntiating bety	ween LCC
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individu LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehens and ELCCA?	past work the fi al team member 5% ive Life Cycle Co 5% iate for this proje Not Scored	m has done s have expe 90.0 pst exercise 90.0 ect. How ca	in decision	elates to the 90.0 making? Ar 95.0 mability strat	e project type	idance for e or comple 85.0 ar with the 9	xity?  DFM require		a they differe	ntiating bet	ween LCC

Brett Riley

9/15/2021

### CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description	
Wenatchee Valley Colleg	ge - Omak Health Science
Ce	nter
Date of Evaluation	Project Number
9/14-15/2021	2021-208
Name of Selection Panel Member	
Rich	Peters

#### This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Design West ALSC Architecture MMEC Architecture **Architects CRITERIA** Weighting Weighted Weighted Weighted Weighted Weighted Raw Score Raw Score Raw Score Raw Score Raw Score Score Score Score Score Score **ORGANIZATION** 15% 95.0 93.0 93.0 14.3 14.0 14.0 Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project for the Client. What is their philosophy towords working collaboratively with clients and other outward looking issues. Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members present and what role are they assuming in the discussion Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their workload for the duration of the project and how this project fits into the firm's overall planning PROJECT MANAGEMENT 25% 97.0 95.0 96.0 Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the Finalist's experience, how well has the team acertained basic project requirements and how well have they managed development of project scope in the past. Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to establish and manage project budgets. How successful have they been with past projects Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedules. How well do they listen to client schedule needs and then meet client schedule needs. PROJECT APPROACH 25% 98.0 95.0 95.0 24.5 23.8 Understanding of this project: Has the Finalist demonstrated that they have reviewed available project information, attended informational mtg, or done independent research to better understand the project and the project requirements Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define challenges and/or opportunities they see for the project? 25% 98.0 90.0 Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past work the firm has done and how that relates or provides guidance for this project? Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual team members have experience that relates to the project type or complexity? 95.0 4.8 93.0 93.0 LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Life Cycle Cost exercise in decision making? Are they familiar with the OFM requirements? Are they differentiating between LCCA and ELCCA? SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE 95.0 4.8 95.0 95.0 What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate for this project. How can the sustainability strategys mesh with the project budget. DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN Scored (indicate included or not included) TOTAL Raw SCORE 578.0 561.0 563.0 100% TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE 93.4 97.0 93.9 5.5 FINAL RANK ORDER 3 2 4 COMMENTS:

Rich Peters

9/15/2)

#### CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description	
Wenatchee Valley College -	Omak Health Science Cente
Date of Evaluation	Project Number
9/14-15/2021	2021-208
Name of Selection Panel Member	·

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record					Larry Gangle								
CRITERIA	Majahtina				MMEC Architecture		Design West Architects						
ONTENA	Weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score		
ORGANIZATION	15%	98.0	14.7	92.0	13.8	95.0	14.3						
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project	for the Client	. What is the	eir philosoph	y towords wo	orking collab	oratively with	clients and	other outwa	rd looking is	sues.			
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members pres	ent and what	role are the	y assuming i	in the discus	sion								
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their workloa	d for the dur	ation of the p	oroject and h	now this proje	ect fits into th	ne firm's over	all planning						
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	25%	95.0	23.8	85.0	21.3	90.0	22.5						
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the F project scope in the past.	inalist's expe	rience, how	well has the	team acerta	ned basic pr	oject require	ments and l	how well hav	e they mana	aged develop	ment of		
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to est	ablish and m	anage proje	ct budgets.	How succes	sful have the	ey been with	past project	s					
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedules	. How well d	o they listen	to client sch	edule needs	and then me	eet client sch	edule needs	S.					
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	98.0	24.5	85.0	21.3	95.0	23.8						
<u>Understanding of this project</u> : Has the Finalist demonstrated that the project and the project requirements <u>Challenges &amp; Opportunities</u> : Has the Finalist attempted to define ch						mational mto	g, or done in	dependent r	esearch to b	etter unders	tand the		
EXPERIENCE	25%	95.0	23.8	80.0	20.0	90.0	22.5						
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past	work the firm	has done a	nd <i>how</i> that	relates or pr	ovides guida	nce for this	project?						
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual tear	m members I	nave experie	ence that rela	ates to the pr	oject type or	complexity?	•						
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	5%	100.0	5.0	100.0	5.0	100.0	5.0						
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Li ELCCA?	fe Cycle Cos	t exercise in	decision ma	iking? Are th	ney familiar v	vith the OFM	requiremen	ts? Are they	differentiati	ng between	LCCA and		
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	5%	100.0	5.0	100.0	5.0	100.0	5.0						
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate fo	r this project	. How can t	he sustainab	ility strategy:	s mesh with	the project b	udget.		1				
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored												
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	586.0		542.0		570.0							
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			96.7		86.3		93.0						
FINAL RANK ORDER			1		3		2						
COMMENTS:					, J								

Sep 15, 2021 Larry Gangle

## 2021-208-ScoresheetSummary

Final Audit Report 2021-09-16

Created: 2021-09-15

By: Angeline Ernst (angeline.ernst@des.wa.gov)

Status: Signed

Transaction ID: CBJCHBCAABAARBQqeALzkLnqrP\_SNoU0epT5dto7oMFX

### "2021-208-ScoresheetSummary" History

- Document created by Angeline Ernst (angeline.ernst@des.wa.gov) 2021-09-15 10:51:11 PM GMT- IP address: 198.238.242.30
- Document emailed to Eric Lester (eric.lester@des.wa.gov) for signature 2021-09-15 10:54:55 PM GMT
- Document emailed to Barbie Downing (barbie.downing@des.wa.gov) for signature 2021-09-15 10:54:55 PM GMT
- Document emailed to Brett Riley (briley@wvc.edu) for signature 2021-09-15 10:54:55 PM GMT
- Document emailed to Rich Peters (rpeters@wvc.edu) for signature 2021-09-15 10:54:56 PM GMT
- Document emailed to Larry A. Gangle (larry@doharchitects.com) for signature 2021-09-15 10:54:56 PM GMT
- Email viewed by Eric Lester (eric.lester@des.wa.gov)
  2021-09-15 10:55:15 PM GMT- IP address: 104.47.65.254
- Email viewed by Barbie Downing (barbie.downing@des.wa.gov) 2021-09-15 10:55:32 PM GMT- IP address: 104.47.65.254
- Document e-signed by Barbie Downing (barbie.downing@des.wa.gov)

  Signature Date: 2021-09-15 10:55:50 PM GMT Time Source: server- IP address: 198.238.242.30
- Document e-signed by Eric Lester (eric.lester@des.wa.gov)

  Signature Date: 2021-09-15 10:56:09 PM GMT Time Source: server- IP address: 198.238.242.30
- Email viewed by Larry A. Gangle (larry@doharchitects.com) 2021-09-15 11:02:57 PM GMT- IP address: 50.35.214.171



Email viewed by Rich Peters (rpeters@wvc.edu)
2021-09-15 - 11:04:34 PM GMT- IP address: 134.39.153.20

Document e-signed by Larry A. Gangle (larry@doharchitects.com)

Signature Date: 2021-09-15 - 11:05:53 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 50.35.214.171

Email viewed by Brett Riley (briley@wvc.edu)

2021-09-15 - 11:18:22 PM GMT- IP address: 134.39.153.20

Email viewed by Brett Riley (briley@wvc.edu)

2021-09-16 - 11:00:48 PM GMT- IP address: 134.39.153.20

Document e-signed by Brett Riley (briley@wvc.edu)

Signature Date: 2021-09-16 - 11:01:11 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 134.39.153.20

Email viewed by Rich Peters (rpeters@wvc.edu)

2021-09-16 - 11:16:13 PM GMT- IP address: 134.39.153.20

Document e-signed by Rich Peters (rpeters@wvc.edu)

Signature Date: 2021-09-16 - 11:19:02 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 134.39.153.20

Agreement completed.

2021-09-16 - 11:19:02 PM GMT